

Appendix C

Rating Scales for FOSS Measures

(1) CONCERN IDENTIFICATION

Effectiveness with which the Survey Team identified and selected concerns throughout the survey

RATING LEVEL	DESCRIPTION OF SURVEY TEAM BEHAVIOR
5 EXTREMELY EFFECTIVE	The team identified the full range, magnitude, and number of concerns apparent from the information available.*
4 VERY EFFECTIVE	Exceeded the description for a rating of “3” but did not meet the description for a rating of “5”
3 SATISFACTORY	The team identified all concerns with adverse impact on residents and many of the other concerns that were apparent from the information available.*
2 LESS THAN SATISFACTORY	Exceeded the description for a rating of “1” but did not meet the description for a rating of “3”
1 MUCH LESS THAN SATISFACTORY	The team failed to identify several of the concerns with adverse impact on residents that were apparent from the information available* and/or they failed to identify most or all of the other concerns.

* Concerns “apparent from the information available”, as used here, includes both concerns identified by the SA Team and those that the SA Team should reasonably have been expected to identify during the survey.

(2) SAMPLE SELECTION

Effectiveness with which the Survey Team selected and modified a resident sample throughout the survey based on identified concerns and survey procedures

RATING LEVEL	DESCRIPTION OF SURVEY TEAM BEHAVIOR
<p>5</p> <p>EXTREMELY EFFECTIVE</p>	<p>Over the course of the survey, the sample accurately reflected the identified concerns*.</p> <p>Throughout the survey, the residents sampled were optimal for confirming or invalidating all identified concerns* and investigating them as possible deficiencies.</p> <p>The sample was case-mix stratified.</p>
<p>4</p> <p>VERY EFFECTIVE</p>	<p>Exceeded the description for a rating of “3” but did not meet the description for a rating of “5”</p>
<p>3</p> <p>SATISFACTORY</p>	<p>Over the course of the survey, the sample reflected most of the identified concerns*.</p> <p>Although a sample could have been selected that would have yielded more information about the identified concerns*, this lack of optimality had no <u>major</u> impact on the team’s effectiveness in confirming or invalidating those concerns or investigating them as possible deficiencies.</p> <p>The sample was case-mix stratified.</p>
<p>2</p> <p>LESS THAN SATISFACTORY</p>	<p>Exceeded the description for a rating of “1” but did not meet the description for a rating of “3”</p>
<p>1</p> <p>MUCH LESS THAN SATISFACTORY</p>	<p>Over the course of the survey, the sample failed to reflect several of the concerns that were (or should have been) identified.</p> <p>The characteristics of the sample made it inadequate for confirming or invalidating the identified concerns* and had a substantial impact on the team’s effectiveness in investigating them as possible deficiencies.</p> <p>The sample was <u>not</u> case-mix stratified.</p>

* The term “identified concerns”, as used here, includes only those concerns identified by the SA Team.

(3) GENERAL INVESTIGATION

Effectiveness with which the Survey Team collected information to determine how the facility's environment and care of residents affect residents' quality of life, health, and safety and residents' ability to reach their highest practicable physical, mental, and psychosocial well-being. This includes the following major investigative areas:

- Facility's physical and psychosocial environment
- Resident needs assessment / highest practicable well-being
- Protection and promotion of resident rights
- Quality assessment and assurance

(4) KITCHEN/FOOD SERVICE INVESTIGATION

Effectiveness with which the Survey Team collected information to determine if the facility is storing, preparing, distributing and serving food according to 42 CFR 483.35(h)(2) to prevent food-borne illness

(5) MEDICATIONS INVESTIGATION

Effectiveness with which the Survey Team collected information to determine if the facility's preparation and administration of medications complies with requirements

RATING LEVEL	DESCRIPTION OF SURVEY TEAM BEHAVIOR
5 EXTREMELY EFFECTIVE	<p>The investigation was characterized by the skillful collection, integration, and coordination of information.</p> <p><u>All</u> of the information gathered was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Factual, and relevant to the quality of facility performance.• Corroborated with a variety of other sources of evidence whenever possible. <p>The investigation was comprehensive and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reflective of the extent and magnitude of deficient practice within the facility.• Sufficient to confirm or invalidate all concerns identified by the State Agency Surveyor(s) for which information could reasonably have been collected.• Sufficient for making deficiency determinations. <p>If the facility had substandard quality of care (if applicable) or Immediate Jeopardy, the findings clearly supported that determination.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">4</p> <p style="text-align: center;">VERY EFFECTIVE</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Exceeded the description for a rating of “3” but did not meet the description for a rating of “5”</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">3</p> <p style="text-align: center;">SATISFACTORY</p>	<p>The investigation was characterized by the organized collection of information and some integration and coordination of that information.</p> <p><u>Most</u> of the information gathered was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Factual, although some may not have been relevant to concerns. • Corroborated with other sources of evidence whenever possible. <p>The investigation was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflective of the extent and magnitude of deficient practice within the facility. • Sufficient to confirm or invalidate all concerns identified by the State Agency Surveyor(s) for which information could reasonably have been collected. • Sufficient for making deficiency determinations. <p>If the facility had substandard quality of care (if applicable) or Immediate Jeopardy, the findings clearly supported that determination.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p style="text-align: center;">LESS THAN SATISFACTORY</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Exceeded the description for a rating of “1” but did not meet the description for a rating of “3”</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <p style="text-align: center;">MUCH LESS THAN SATISFACTORY</p>	<p>The investigation was characterized by the unorganized collection of information and poor integration and analysis of the information.</p> <p><u>Many</u> of the pieces of information gathered were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subjective rather than factual. • <u>Not</u> corroborated with other sources of evidence, even when this would have been possible. <p>The investigation was <u>not</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflective of the extent and magnitude of deficient practice within the facility. • Sufficient to confirm or invalidate some or all concerns identified by the State Agency Surveyor(s). • Sufficient for making deficiency determinations. <p>If the facility had substandard quality of care (if applicable) or Immediate Jeopardy, the findings did not reflect that situation and/or did not support that determination.</p>

(6) DEFICIENCY DETERMINATION

Effectiveness with which the Survey Team determined the facility's compliance with Federal Regulations

RATING LEVEL	DESCRIPTION OF SURVEY TEAM BEHAVIOR
5 EXTREMELY EFFECTIVE	<p>Correctly determined whether all findings* constituted deficiencies OR For revisit surveys, correctly determined all deficiencies above the level of substantial compliance.</p> <p>Correctly selected all regulatory requirements.</p> <p>Made correct determinations of the magnitude and extent of all citations that could contribute to substandard quality of care or rise to severity level 3 or 4.</p>
4 VERY EFFECTIVE	<p>Exceeded the description for a rating of “3” but did not meet the description for a rating of “5”</p>
3 SATISFACTORY	<p>Correctly determined whether findings* constituted deficiencies for all citations that could result in substandard quality of care, or that could rise to the level of harm or Immediate Jeopardy OR For revisit surveys, correctly determined all deficiencies above the level of substantial compliance.</p> <p>Selected some regulatory requirements that were less than optimal, but not totally inappropriate.</p> <p>Made correct determinations of the magnitude and extent of all citations that could contribute to substandard quality of care or rise to severity level 3 or 4.</p>
2 LESS THAN SATISFACTORY	<p>Exceeded the description for a rating of “1” but did not meet the description for a rating of “3”</p>
1 MUCH LESS THAN SATISFACTORY	<p>Made incorrect determinations of whether some findings* constituted deficiencies OR For revisit surveys, did not correctly determine all deficiencies above the level of substantial compliance.</p> <p>Selected some inappropriate regulatory requirements.</p> <p>Made many incorrect determinations of the magnitude and extent of citations, including at least one citation that could contribute to substandard quality of care or rise to severity level 3 or 4.</p>

* The term “findings,” as used here, includes both the SA Team’s findings and those discovered by the RO Evaluator(s) that the SA Team should have discovered based on the identified concerns.